



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/564,285

01/11/2006

Eric Delattre

0513-1160

7543

466 7590 03/09/2009
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MCCOMMAS, STUART S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/09/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/564,285 | Applicant(s) DELATTRE, ERIC | |
| | Examiner Stuart McCommas | Art Unit 2629 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stuart McCommas. (3) James Livingston.

(2) Sumati Lefkowitz. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 04 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 13, 14 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shaw.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative discussed the prior art and made arguments as to how it does not meet the claim limitations. Applicant's representative suggested minor amendments to clarify the invention, and the Examiner agreed that the amendments to claims 14 and 17 appear to distinguish over the prior art. Applicant disagreed with the Examiner's interpretation of claim 13.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| | /Sumati Lefkowitz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629 |
|--|--|